

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/770,061 01/24/2001 | | 01/24/2001 | Russell D. Homer | 01 P 7429 US | 7192 | |
| 26161 | 7590 | 04/07/2005 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| FISH & RIO | | SON PC | NGUYEN, V | NGUYEN, VAN KIM T | | |
| BOSTON, MA 02110 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | 2151 | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-------------------|--------------|--|
| 09/770,061 | HOMER ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Van Kim T. Nguyen | 2151 | |

| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Before the Filling of all Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | |
| | Van Kim T. Nguyen | 2151 | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 23 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of | | - 61tt | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TO | | | | | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) |). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) | n fee under 37 as set forth in (b) | | | | | |
| 2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of App was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4 Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CAPPEAR APPEAR A | 1.37 must be filed within two mont CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal clime period set forth in 37 CFR 41. | hs of the date of filing of the appeal. Since a 37(a). | the Notice of Notice of | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | nsideration and/or search (see NO | f, will <u>not</u> be entered TE below); | because | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bef appeal; and/or | | educing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | | jected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | | , timely filed amendm | ent canceling | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w vided below or appended. | ill be entered and an | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida | lotice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence i | ot be entered s necessary | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). | | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | entry is below or attac | hed. | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowa | nce because: | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other: | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s) | | | | | | |
| • | | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added limitations, "recombining the independent data stream and the independent clock stream to form a recombined clock-data stream; and re-synchronizing the recombined clock-data stream to the first clock domain" in claim 1, raise new issues which would require further considereation and/or search.

RUPAL DHARIA

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER